



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

207

COCP-433-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.04.2026

Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner

V/s

Arvind and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Sajjan Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Shazia K. Singh, Advocate, for the respondents.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The instant contempt petition, preferred under Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as the "1971 Act") alleges willful disobedience of order dated 29.09.2020 (Annexure P-1) passed in CWP-15771-2020;

"Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that petitioner is duly qualified Guest Lecturer. He is working since 16.08.2019. His grievance is that respondent Nos.5 and 6 have now been transferred against the conditions mentioned in their appointment letters. He further contends that petitioner cannot be replaced by way of transfer of respondent Nos.5 and 6.

Notice of motion for 14.12.2020.

In the meantime, petitioner shall not be replaced by respondent Nos.5 and 6 or any other guest faculty by way of transfer."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though after passing of the aforesaid interim order, the petitioner has not been replaced, inadequate workload is being given and consequently, lesser remuneration is being paid to the petitioner in circumvention of the said order.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents submits that as per the University Rules, the workload is distributed amongst contract teachers after completion of workload of regular teachers. She, therefore, submits that inadequate workload is not being given to the petitioner. She

further submits that even otherwise, the interim order was not to replace the petitioner by respondents No.5 and 6 in the writ petition or by any other Guest Faculty, which is not being done and the petitioner has not been replaced.

4. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

5. The writ Court had directed that the petitioner would not be replaced by respondents No.5 and 6 therein or by any other Guest Faculty by way of transfer. As to whether inadequate work is being given or not, is not a matter which can be decided in the instant contempt petition. The rights of the parties shall be decided by the writ Court.

6. That being so, the instant contempt petition is found to be devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

April 09, 2026
vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No